

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9, 11-22, and 24-34 are currently pending. Claims 32-34 have been added by the present amendment. The additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2-9, 11-22, and 24-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,982,370 to Kamper (hereinafter “the ‘370 patent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,808 to Evans et al. (hereinafter “the ‘808 patent”).

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview granted Applicants’ representative on November 1, 2005, at which time the outstanding rejection of the claims was discussed. In particular, the disclosure of the ‘370 patent regarding displaying a pop-up menu prepared based on the content of a search result was discussed. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the outstanding rejection of the claims upon formal submission of a response to the outstanding Office Action.

Claim 2 is directed to a method of managing information, comprising: (1) identifying a word of an image as a keyword; (2) determining a search result corresponding to the keyword; (3) displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content of the search result; (4) displaying information corresponding to the search result; and (5) displaying additional information corresponding to a selection of a portion of the displayed information.

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and the rejection of Claim 2 (and dependent Claims 3-9 and 11-16) should be withdrawn.

The '370 patent is directed to a search interface including a highlight tool used to identify search terms in an HTML document displayed on a web browser. The '370 patent discloses that upon selection of text, a pop-up menu appears that offers the user the option of searching for the text. See '370 patent, Figures 5c and 5f. Further, as shown in Figure 5h, the '370 patent discloses a system in which an optional pop-up menu is displayed to allow the user to save links to web pages obtained by a search, without requiring the user to visit the web site. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '370 patent fails to disclose displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content of the search result. None of the pop-up menus disclosed by the '370 patent are prepared based on the content of a search result, as recited in amended Claim 2. Rather, the menus shown in Figures 5c, 5f, and 5h are "standard," predetermined pop-up menus that are displayed independently of the content of a search result.

The '370 patent fails to disclose that the content of the search result has anything to do with the pop-up menus disclosed by the '370 patent. At most, the '370 patent discloses that a pop-up menu is displayed *in response to* the user highlighting text of the search result. However, the '370 patent does not disclose that the pop-up menu that is ultimately displayed is prepared based on a content of the search result, as recited in Claim 2. Rather, as shown in Figure 5f, the '370 patent discloses pop-up menus having choices such as "start a new search," "expand the search," etc. Applicants submit that such menus are not prepared based on a content of the search result. The content of the search result appears to be irrelevant to the '370 pop-up menus. Nevertheless, the Office Action implies that, because the '370 patent discloses that the user highlights text of the search result, the user is marking "content" of the search result. As a result, the Office Action reasons, the pop-up-menu limitation of Claim 2 is met because the '370 patent discloses that a pop-up menu is displayed after the user's selection. However, Applicants submit that highlighting text in a search result does not

read on preparing a pop-up menu based on the content of a search result. Regardless of what the '370 user highlights, none of the '370 pop-up menus are prepared based on the content of a search result; they are always the same! The '370 pop-up menus list predetermined choices that are independent of the content of the search result.

The '808 patent is directed to a method and apparatus for displaying portions of text for multiple documents over multiple databases related to a search query. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '808 patent fails to disclose displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on the content of a search result, as recited in amended Claim 2.

Accordingly, no matter how the teachings of the '370 and '808 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the step of displaying, on a display unit, a pop-up menu prepared based on a content of the search result, as recited in Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and the rejection of Claim 2 (and dependent Claims 3-9 and 11-16) should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 17, 30, and 31 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in amended Claim 2. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that the a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and the rejections of Claims 17, 30, and 31 (and all associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

The present amendment also sets forth new Claims 32-34 for examination on the merits. New Claim 32, which depends from Claim 2, clarifies that the step of displaying the pop-up menu comprises displaying text corresponding to the search result as text in the pop-up menu. Further, new Claim 33, which depends from Claim 2, recites that the step of displaying the pop-up menu comprises determining text to be displayed in the pop-up menu,

wherein the text corresponds to documents searched in obtaining the search result. In addition, new Claim 34, which depends from Claim 2, recites that the text displayed in the pop-up menu varies according to the content of the search result. New Claims 32-34 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.¹ Moreover, based on the asserted allowability of Claim 2, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 32-34 patentably define over the '370 and '808 patents.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 2, 17, 30, and 31 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '370 and '808 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Kurt M. Berger

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

JJK:KMB\la
I:\ATTY\KMB\240's\240117US\240117US-AM2.DOC

¹ See, e.g., Figure 4 and the discussion related thereto in the specification.